



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/716,718

11/19/2003

Richard C. Ferri

POU920030185US1

6317

7590

03/31/2005

Andrew J. Wojnicki, Jr.  
Intellectual Property Law  
IBM Corporation, MS P386  
2455 South Road  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER

MARSH, STEVEN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3632

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/716,718

Applicant(s)

FERRI ET AL.

Examiner

Steven M Marsh

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This is the second office action for U.S. Application 10/716,718 for a Supporting Adapter for Portable Computer system filed by Richard C. Ferri et al. on November 19, 2003.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim is dependent upon itself. For examination purposes, it is assumed that Applicant intended to make the claim dependent upon claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-3, 6-16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,859,762 to Clark et al. Clark et al. discloses an adapter with a support plate (bottom of 24) that has a top surface and a bottom surface opposite the top surface. There is a connector provided from the bottom surface adapted to mount the support plate to a support stand (at 22) and a plurality of latches (38) provided from the top surface, operable to secure a portable computing device to the support plate. The connector has a threaded stud (the screws that extend through 22 and the bottom of the plate). The latches can engage a keyhole in a bottom surface of a computing device and there is at least one pivot (52). The support plate has sidewalls (sides and back of 24, extending from the bottom) extending upwardly from the top surface that are dimensioned such that when the adapter is attached to a portable

Art Unit: 3632

computing device, the sidewalls do not obstruct elements of the portable computing device normally available for use.

There is a plurality of interior electrical connectors and a plurality of exterior electrical connectors coupled to the interior electrical connectors, whereby the exterior electrical connectors are adapted to mate with a plurality of corresponding cables, thereby connecting the electrical connectors of the portable computing device to the corresponding cables. The adapter can also function as a port replicator or a docking station. There is also a connector (40) provided from the side surface that is adapted to removably mount the support plate to a cooperating support.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 5, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,093,326 to Ford. Clark et al. does not disclose a tripod mounted to connector of the adapter. Clark et al. does disclose a stand (14) attached to the connector and the top surface of the plate faces away from the stand. Ford discloses the use of a photography tripod (94) as a stand for mounting a housing. The stand is mounted to the bottom of the housing (at 98) by a threaded connector and the tripod allows for the legs to be folded. It would have been

Art Unit: 3632

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have provided a tripod as the stand for the device taught by Clark et al., as taught by Ford, for the purpose of providing a stand that folds. Clark et al. in view of Ford does not specifically disclose threaded openings for receiving the threaded screws. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have provided threaded openings in the bottom of the plate to receive the threaded screws to provide a secure connection, as a matter of engineering preference.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed January 12, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Clark fails to teach or suggest a support plate having a latch operable to engage a cooperating opening in a computing device. However, the latch taught by Clark is capable of engaging an opening. Applicant does not claim that the latch engages an opening, only that it be capable of engaging an opening.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Steven Marsh whose telephone number is (703) 305-0098. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM to 4:30 PM. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

SM

Steven M. Marsh

March 23, 2005

  
LESLIE A. BRAUN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER